<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated July 17, 2008. Claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 17 to 46 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 9 and 12 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 9, 12, 17, 23 and 29 were objected to because of informalities. These claims have been amended as suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 12, 15, 16, 19, 25, 31, 36, 37, 39 to 45, 63, 65, and 67 to 70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for alleged failure to comply with the enablement requirement. In response, independent Claim 1 has been amended so that the claim limitations correspond more closely to an apparatus such as that depicted in Fig. 2, as suggested by the Examiner. Specifically, Claim 1 has been amended to replace "candidate folder search device" with "processor that executes program code for a candidate folder search process", so as to more closely correspond to a hardware construction. The "processor" is supported by the description of Fig. 2 at page 7 of the specification, and the "candidate folder search process" is supported by the description of Fig. 3 beginning at page 8 of the specification.

Independent Claims 9 and 12 are directed to a method and a computer readable storage medium, respectively, and do not recite a "candidate folder search device". Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 to 46, 63, 65 and 67 to 70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,418,946 (Mori) in view of "Navigational utilities: finding your way through the maze" (Waltz). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention involves searching for a folder to store a new document based on similarities between the new document and other documents stored in a candidate folder. More specifically, the present invention involves retaining a plurality of folders, each having at least one document, in a folder retaining memory in a document storing system. The plurality of folders is searched to identify at least one candidate folder suitable for storing the new document among the plurality of folders, by comparing a feature of the new document with an average of features of the documents stored in at least one candidate folder among the plurality of folders. In response to the identification of the at least one candidate folder, the identified candidate folder is displayed, and the new document is stored into a selected folder selected by a user from among the at least one displayed candidate folder.

Applicants submit that the applied references, alone or in any permissible combination, are not seen to disclose or to suggest the notion of storing a new document in a displayed candidate folder that has been identified by comparing a feature of the new document with an average of features of the documents stored the candidate folder. More particularly, the applied references are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of (i) searching a plurality of folders to identify at least one candidate folder suitable for storing a new document among the plurality of folders, by comparing a feature of the new document with an average of features of the documents stored in at least one candidate

folder among the plurality of folders, and in response to identifying the at least one

candidate folder, displaying the identified candidate folder, and (ii) storing the new

document into a selected folder selected by a user from among the at least one displayed

candidate folder.

Mori is seen to disclose classifying stored documents according to a query.

As illustrated in Fig. 2, stored documents 231, 233 and 234 within a retrieval object folder

are retrieved. The retrieved documents are classified into document subsets 260 and 270 in

accordance with the contents of a component represented by a classification attribute of a

retrieval query. The classified subsets are displayed on corresponding virtual folders 280

and 290. Each virtual folder has a retrieval query and shows a document set satisfying a

retrieval condition of the retrieval query as if the document set is in the virtual folder. By

generating the virtual folder, classification of documents satisfying given conditions

defined by a user is realized.

On the other hand, the present invention involves searching a plurality of

folders to identify at least one candidate folder suitable for storing a new document among

the plurality of folders. The candidate folder is identified by comparing a feature of the

new document with an average of features of the documents stored in at least one candidate

folder among the plurality of folders. In response to the identification of the at least one

candidate folder, the at least one identified candidate folder is displayed, and the new

document is stored into a selected folder selected by a user from among the at least one

displayed candidate folder.

In contrast, Mori is seen to disclose displaying classified subsets of retrieved

documents on virtual folders. Mori's classified subsets are merely displayed on virtual

- 13 -

folders, which are not actual folders for storage, but rather display views represented in the form of a folder. Thus, the retrieved documents are merely believed to be displayed on the virtual folders while still being stored in the same retrieval object folder that is not classified. Therefore, Mori is believed to be silent on storing a new document in a displayed candidate folder that has been identified by comparing a feature of the new document with an average of features of the documents stored the candidate folder.

Waltz has been studied, but it is not seen to teach anything that, when combined with Mori, would overcome the deficiencies of Mori as described above.

Therefore, Mori and Waltz, alone or in any permissible combination, are not believed to disclose or suggest the notion of storing a new document in a displayed candidate folder that has been identified by comparing a feature of the new document with an average of features of the documents stored the candidate folder. More particularly, Mori and Waltz are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of (i) searching a plurality of folders to identify at least one candidate folder suitable for storing a new document among the plurality of folders, by comparing a feature of the new document with an average of features of the documents stored in at least one candidate folder among the plurality of folders, and in response to identifying the at least one candidate folder, displaying the identified candidate folder, and (ii) storing the new document into a selected folder selected by a user from among the at least one displayed candidate folder.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 9 and 12, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due. However, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shant Tchakerian #61,825/
Shant H. Tchakerian
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 61,825

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2471361v1